

Christchurch City Council
Point of Contact Service Satisfaction
Residents Survey Results

2025-2026

Monitoring and Research Team
Performance Management Unit
March 2026

Table of Contents


INTRODUCTION	3
RATIONALE FOR RESIDENTS SURVEY FRAMEWORK	3
SUMMARY OF LEVELS OF SERVICE RESULTS: POINT OF CONTACT SURVEYS 2025-2026	5
ADDITIONAL SERVICE SATISFACTION RESULTS	6
SURVEY RESULTS	8
ACTIVITY: CITIZENS AND CUSTOMER SERVICES	8
<i>Walk In Customer Service</i>	8
<i>Telephone Customer Service</i>	10
ACTIVITY: COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT	13
<i>External Communications</i>	13
ACTIVITY: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND FACILITIES	15
<i>Community Development and Capacity Building Initiatives</i>	15
ACTIVITY: LIBRARIES NGĀ KETE WĀNANGA O ŌTAUTAHI	17
<i>Libraries</i>	17
ACTIVITY: RECREATION, SPORTS, COMMUNITY ARTS AND EVENTS	19
<i>Community Events</i>	19
<i>Event Support</i>	20
<i>Recreation and Sport Support</i>	22
<i>Recreation and Sport Facilities</i>	24
ACTIVITY: PARKS AND FORESHORE	27
<i>Community Parks</i>	27
<i>Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale</i>	29
<i>Regional Parks</i>	31
<i>Cemetery Administration Services</i>	33
<i>Cemeteries</i>	34
<i>Hagley Park</i>	37
<i>Marine Structures</i>	38
<i>Environmental, Conservation, Water and Civil Defence Education Programmes</i>	41
ACTIVITY: BUILDING REGULATION	44
<i>Case Management Service</i>	44
ACTIVITY: RESOURCE CONSENTING	46
<i>Resource Consenting Process</i>	46
ACTIVITY: TRANSPORT	48
<i>Perception of Vehicle and Personal Safety at Council Off-Street Parking Facilities</i>	48
<i>Public Transport Facilities</i>	50
APPENDIX 1: SATISFACTION RESULTS FOR ADDITIONAL SERVICES	52
EMAIL CUSTOMER SERVICE	52
<i>Quality of the Service Received for Email Services</i>	52
COMMUNITY FACILITIES	54
<i>Range and Quality of Council Operated Community Facilities</i>	54
SPORTS PARKS	57
<i>Presentation of Sports Parks</i>	57
REGIONAL PARKS	60
<i>Presentation of Regional Parks</i>	60
MARINE STRUCTURES	61
<i>Presentation of Marine Structures</i>	61
GOVERNANCE AND DECISION MAKING: PEOPLE WHO ATTENDED HEARINGS OR MADE DEPUTATIONS	62
<i>Understanding of Council Decisions</i>	62
<i>Public Influence on Council Decision Making</i>	63
<i>Opportunities to Participate in and Contribute to Council Decision Making</i>	64
<i>Decision Making Processes Easy to Use and Engage With</i>	64
<i>Making Decisions in Best Interests of City</i>	65
PUBLIC TRANSPORT FACILITIES	66
<i>Appearance, Safety and Ease of Use of Bus Interchange and Hubs</i>	66

Introduction

Rationale for Residents Survey Framework

Christchurch City Council began surveying residents on a regular basis in 1991 with the introduction of a face to face Annual Survey of Residents. The Council's Residents Survey framework assesses a total of 37 Levels of Service Measures of Success under 15 different Activities. It also assesses some other services for ongoing organisation performance trend monitoring. The Residents Survey includes a two part framework:

1. **General Service Satisfaction Survey** – this measures resident perceptions of satisfaction with Council services that the general population of Christchurch is likely to have had experience using (such as the water supply and roads). Survey content is closely aligned with Levels of Service in Service Plans (and uses, where possible, a consistent style of satisfaction questioning across services). It also includes an overall Council service performance measure and an overall effort or ease of interaction with Council measure. The online survey is conducted in January each year with a representative sample of 770 residents aged 18 years and over (quotas are applied for age, gender and ward). The overall questionnaire length is approximately 15 minutes. The General Service Satisfaction Survey measures 16 Levels of Service Measures of Success under 9 Activities. In January each year a Life in Christchurch booster survey is undertaken to boost participation by Māori, Pacific Peoples, Asian and those aged 18-24 years. This survey includes some of the key General Service Satisfaction Survey questions such as overall service performance, ease of interaction with Council and core infrastructure satisfaction.
2. **Point of Contact Service Satisfaction Surveys** – this is a series of surveys conducted during the year at the point of contact with Council services. Surveys cover services identified as better suited to assessment by users at the time they use a service or where there is a very specific customer base (eg. library users and resource consent applicants). A range of survey methods is used including onsite and telephone sequential mixed method surveying (onsite and online survey completions); postal/mail drop surveys and email surveys to people on Council data bases. Point of contact surveys are used to measure 21 Levels of Service Measures of Success under 9 Activities.



NB: A Life in Christchurch booster survey may also be undertaken to ensure better representation across the Residents Survey by various ethnic groups and by young people

Methodology

- Survey questions based on Levels of Service in Activity Plans and/or existing surveys
- Where applicable, questions use a five point satisfaction scale (very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, don't know / not applicable)
- Point of Contact Service Satisfaction Surveys are conducted at service sites or users are contacted by either telephone, email, post or mail drop with either a random sample or the total population of service users
- Respondent sample sizes range from approximately 5 to 3,400 per service, depending on factors such as user numbers and scale of services provided at the site

- A range of sites are selected for each service, (random selection of small, medium and larger sites) (service size is determined by factors such as user numbers and scale of services provided at the location)
- A variety of survey methods are used to gather information, with surveys taking on average 2-3 minutes to complete: Most of the surveys are administered using a sequential mixed methodology of onsite, mail drop/postal and online surveying. Respondents are asked if they would give feedback at the site about the service and if they agree, they are interviewed or given a self-complete form. Those who do not want to complete the survey onsite are asked for their email address and are then sent an online feedback form. Some surveys are completed as email collectors (using lists supplied by business units), postal/mail drop or as telephone interviews¹.
- Overall 8,089 Point of Contact surveys were completed in 2025-2026: of those completed via the summer research programme, 33.3% were completed face to face; 3.0% were completed by mail drop or post and 63.7% were completed online. The overall completion rate for the summer point of contact surveys was 23.7%.

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Customer services research suggests that customers want, with minimal effort on their part, to be able to interact with organisations in the easiest possible way for them, with their needs met so that they can get on with their busy lives (Corporate Executive Board 2014 *Blinded by Delight: Why Service Fails and How to Fix It* CEB, Arlington). A measure of ease of interaction with Council services, based on customer services principles, has been added to all point of contact feedback forms. This question tests respondent perceptions of how easy it is for them to interact with or use a Council service, based on efficient and effective processes and/or receiving respectful, prompt and efficient service by staff who understand customer/citizen needs and who provide accurate advice and effective options to address needs and resolve issues.

¹ With the potential for disruption to onsite surveying in 2021-2022 due to COVID restrictions, permanent changes were made to simplify the wording of many questions across the Residents Survey programme to ensure surveys could be delivered in a contactless manner if required. While the changes did not impact the intent of the questions, some caution is needed when comparing results to previous years.

Summary of Levels of Service Results: Point of Contact Surveys 2025-2026

NOTES: In 2021-2022 minor question wording simplification occurred across many measures and while the changes did not impact the intent of the questions, some caution is needed when comparing results to earlier years. Some pre 2021-2022 and pre 2018-2019 results have been adjusted to align with current LOS performance standards (footnotes below indicate which results this affects). To view unadjusted results, see previous years' results tables

Activity Group	Activity	Level of Service Measure of Success	Type of Measure	2025-26 Performance Target	2025-26 Target Met	Satisfaction Score Trend Since Last Year	Higher and Lower Satisfaction Services in 2025-26	Survey Result 2025-26	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2025-26	Survey Result 2024-25	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2024-25	Survey Result 2023-24	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2023-24	Survey Result 2022-23	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2022-23
Communities and Citizens	Citizens and Customer Services	2.6.7.1 Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for walk in services	Community	At least 85%				99%	97%	99%	98%	98%	97%	98%	95%
		2.6.7.3 Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for phone contacts	Community	At least 85%				89% ¹	79%	86% ¹	89%	88% ¹	85%	90% ¹	92%
	Libraries	3.1.5 Maintain library user satisfaction with the library service	Community	At least 90%				94%	96%	96%	97%	95%	95%	96%	98%
	Community Development and Facilities	4.1.27.1 Customer satisfaction with the delivery of community support, resilience, development, and recreation initiatives	Community	80%				88%	82%	83%	78%	86%	76%	79%	66%
	Recreation, Sports, Community Arts and Events	2.8.5.2 Customer satisfaction with the content and delivery across delivered events	Community	At least 80%				88%	86%	78%	83%	88%	80%	89% ¹	75%
		2.8.6.2 Customer satisfaction with the quality of Council event support	Community	At least 80%				91%	84%	95%	88%	86%	76%	83%	85%
		7.0.3.2 Customer satisfaction with the quality of Council recreation and sport support	Community	At least 80%				93%	83%	94%	88%	93%	85%	87%	76%
		7.0.7 Customer satisfaction with the range and quality of facilities	Community	At least 80%				92%	93%	91%	92%	92% ⁶	92%	91% ⁶	93%
Strategic Planning and Policy	Communications and Engagement	4.1.10.1 Resident satisfaction that our external communications, marketing and engagement activities are timely, accurate, relevant and clear	Community	79%				80%	72%	78%	79%	73%	64%	72%	67%
Parks, Heritage and Coastal Environment	Parks and Foreshore	6.0.3 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Community Parks	Community	≥ 60%				62%	64%	55%	73%	54%	69%	61%	80%
		6.2.2 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Garden Parks – Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale	Community	≥ 90%				99%	93%	99%	95%	99%	94%	99%	97%
	6.3.5 Customer satisfaction with the recreational opportunities and ecological experiences provided by the City's Regional Parks	Community	≥ 80%				85%	85%	89%	86%	88%	87%	84%	80%	
	6.4.4 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Cemeteries	Community	≥ 85%				73%	81%	87%	87%	85%	98%	84%	90%	
	6.4.5 Customer satisfaction with cemetery administration services	Community	≥ 95%				97%	98%	100%	100%	95% ⁴	93% ⁴	97% ⁴	93% ⁴	
	6.8.4.1 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of Hagley Park	Community	≥ 90%				99%	87%	98%	87%	95%	96%	97%	95%	
	10.8.1.1 Customer satisfaction with the availability of public marine structure facilities	Community	≥ 60%				67%	86%	71%	90%	75%	81%	65%	79%	
	19.1.6 Teacher satisfaction with the delivery of Environmental, Conservation, Water, and Civil Defence education programmes	Community	≥ 95%				100%	98%	100%	99%	100%	99%	100%	99%	
		9.1.15.2 Customer satisfaction with quality Case Management Services	Management	80%				95%	98%	87%	82%	98% ⁷	97%	NA	NA

Regulatory and Compliance	Strategic Planning and Resource Consents	9.2.7 Customer satisfaction with the resource consenting process	Community	70%		⏸	🔧	76%	58%	79%	69%	86%	79%	71%	69%
Transport	Transport	10.3.7 Maintain customer satisfaction with vehicle and personal security at Council off-street parking facilities	Community	≥ 50%		📈	🔧	78%	86%	72%	85%	78% ⁵	90%	77% ⁵	79%
		10.4.4 Improve customer satisfaction with public transport facilities (quality of bus stops and bus priority measures)	Community	≥ 73%		⏸	🔧	79%	97%	79% ⁸	91%	69%	85%	76%	91%

1 Sample may include non-residents of Christchurch. Prior to 2023-2024, LOS 2.6.7.2 was measured using three questions: time taken to respond; email being clear, professional; and easy to understand and email efficient way to communicate. From 2023-2024 onward, the level of service was measured using two questions: email efficient way to communicate; and email ease of contact as these two questions better reflect what the business unit is aiming to measure. Therefore, pre 2023-2024 data is not directly comparable. However, using the pre-2023-2024 methodology the result in 2023-2024 was still 68% satisfied

2 This score has been adjusted to allow comparability with current LOS scoring (ie. the same aggregate measures have been used for each year)

3 Caution must be taken in interpreting this result due to small sample size

4 From 2021-2022 onward, sample includes resident customers of cemetery support services (eg. who purchased plots) as well as funeral directors and monumental masons. From 2022-2023 onward, the ease of use question is asked of all funeral directors but only resident customers who had someone buried or interred

5 From 2022-2023 onward, the LOS is measured via the point of contact survey. Prior to 2022-2023 the official LOS score came from the General Service Satisfaction Survey result (2022 GSS: 52% satisfied, 34% neither and 8% dissatisfied). Official pre-2022-2023 results are not comparable with results from 2022-2023 onward as the General Service Satisfaction Survey was carried out online, included non-users of parking buildings and was not restricted to assessment at two facilities. From 2022-2023 the survey was carried out onsite at two facilities only. In 2021-2022, a trial survey was carried out onsite at the Art Gallery and Lichfield parking buildings with the following results which are comparable to results from 2022-2023 onward: 82% satisfied, 12% neither and 5% dissatisfied. The 2020-2021 result was recalibrated to exclude non-users of Council parking facilities (non-users had a satisfaction score of 38%)

6 Prior to 2022-2023, LOS 7.0.7 was measured via the University of South Australia's CERM Survey. Measurement of the LOS was moved to in-house point of contact surveying in 2022-2023. Pre 2022-2023 results show the overall satisfaction percentage rather than the CERM score

7 Surveyed via Residents Survey point of contact surveying from 2023-2024 onward. The case management service started in 2015-2016

8 Results cannot be compared to previous years due to question changes

	LOS target met		LOS target not met		Data still being collected or analysed by business units
	Baseline result or target to be set		Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use consistent with LOS result (within 5%)	NA	Deleted Level of Service or no information available
	Higher satisfaction services (85%+ satisfaction)		Moderate satisfaction services (between 50% to 84% satisfaction)		Lower satisfaction services (less than 50% satisfaction)
	Increase in satisfaction score by 4% or more since last year		Satisfaction score remained same or within 3% of last year		Decrease in satisfaction score by 4% or more since last year
	Key higher satisfaction services that other services could learn from (90%+ satisfaction) (exemplars)				

Additional Service Satisfaction Results

Service	Detail	Old LOS Target ⁴	Old LOS Target Met ⁴	Satisfaction Score Trend Since Last Year	Higher and Lower Satisfaction Services in 2025-26	Survey Result 2025-26	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2025-26	Survey Result 2024-25	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2024-25	Survey Result 2023-24	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2023-24	Survey Result 2022-23	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2022-23	Survey Result 2021-22	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2021-22
Email Customer Services	Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for email services	75%		⏸	🔧	73% ^{1a}	73%	72% ^{1a}	74%	68% ^{1a}	71%	74% ^{1a}	72%	76% ^{1a}	73%
Community Facilities	Deliver a high level of customer satisfaction with the range and quality of Council operated community facilities	80%		⏸	🔧	87%	85%	87%	85%	84%	87%	81%	78%	80%	73%
Sports Parks	Deliver a high level of customer satisfaction with the range and quality of sports parks	90%		📈	🔧	77%	84%	73%	85%	67% ¹	85%	67% ¹	87%	70% ¹	87%
Regional Parks	Overall customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Parks – Regional Parks	≥ 80%		⏸	🔧	81%	85%	83%	86%	86%	87%	81%	80%	88%	89%
Marine Structures	Customer satisfaction with marine structure facilities (presentation)	90%		📈	🔧	73%	86%	67%	90%	71%	81%	62%	79%	61%	72%
Governance and Decision Making	Percentage of residents that understand how Council makes decisions (users of governance services)	NA	NA	⏸	🔧	50%	NA	51%	NA	46% ³	NA	45% ³	NA	42% ³	NA
	Percentage of residents that feel the public has some or a large influence on the decisions the Council makes (users of governance services)	NA	NA	📈	🔧	37%	NA	33%	NA	35%	NA	34%	NA	33%	NA

	Percentage of residents that feel they can participate in and contribute to Council decision making (opportunities to have a say) (users of governance services)	NA	NA			55%	NA	55% ⁵	NA	48%	NA	49%	NA	46%	NA
	Percentage of residents that feel they can participate in and contribute to Council decision making (processes easy to engage with) (users of governance services)	NA	NA			45%	NA	42% ⁵	NA	48%	NA	40%	NA	43%	NA
	Percentage of residents that have confidence the Council makes decisions in the best interests of the city (users of governance services)	NA	NA			30%	NA	28%	NA	19%	NA	23%	NA	27%	NA
Transport	Ensure user satisfaction with appearance, safety and ease of use of transport interchange(s) and suburban hubs	≥ 90%				87%	97%	84%	97%	84%	96%	80%	97%	89%	96%

1a Sample may include non-residents of Christchurch. Prior to 2024-2025, this was a level of service in the LTP. Prior to 2023-2024, LOS 2.6.7.2 was measured using three questions: time taken to respond; email being clear, professional; and easy to understand and email efficient way to communicate. From 2023-2024 onward, the level of service was measured using two questions: email efficient way to communicate; and email ease of contact as these two questions better reflect what the business unit is aiming to measure. Therefore, pre 2023-2024 data is not directly comparable. However, using the pre-2023-2024 methodology the result in 2023-2024 was still 68% satisfied

1 This score is based on an average score comprised of range of sport support facilities, sports park condition and information provided for sports parks

2 This score has been adjusted to allow comparability with current scoring (ie. the same aggregate measures have been used for both years)

3 This score is based on an aggregate measure of 'understanding of Council decision making' (a. understanding of how Council makes decisions, b. accuracy of information about Council decisions, and c. prompt and timely information about decisions). This aligns with the calculation of LOS 4.1.18 'understanding of Council decision making' measured through the General Service Satisfaction Survey (for residents generally)

4 The Old LOS Target is the last available target that had been set for these services (ie. included in the 2018-2028 or 2015-2025 LTPs). If that level of service target was applied to the current result, would the service have passed that target?

5 Caution must be used when comparing these results to previous years as the measurement scale has changed from a satisfaction scale to an agreement scale and pre 2024-2025, the score combined both the opportunities to have a say and the process ease of use questions. The opportunities to have a say question now includes reference to adequacy of opportunities. Results from previous years have been recalibrated to separate opportunities to have a say and ease of use questions

Survey Results

Activity: Citizens and Customer Services

Walk In Customer Service

2.6.7.1 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 85%

2.6.7.1 Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for walk in services

Target: At least 85%

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

Walk In:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with how FRIENDLY and RESPECTFUL the staff member you spoke to today was?
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you that they UNDERSTOOD WHAT YOU NEEDED?
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with HOW THEY RESPONDED to your enquiry? *This includes checking your needs were met and following up on any other issues*
4. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you that our walk-in service was PROFESSIONAL and EFFICIENT? *This includes fast service, helpful instructions or signs and the presentation of counter staff*


Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2025

Completed Surveys: 150

Sites Surveyed: 5

Service Centres	Number
CIVIC OFFICES (HEREFORD STREET)	30
MATATIKI HORNBY SERVICE CENTRE	25
LINWOOD SERVICE CENTRE	25
SHIRLEY SERVICE CENTRE	25
TE HAPUA HALSWELL	45
Total	150


**Overall Satisfaction with First Point of Contact Customer Services
WALK IN (LOS 2.6.7.1)**



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Walk in manner	n	139	10	0	0	0	1	150
	%	92.7%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	100.0%
Walk in understanding of needs	n	138	11	1	0	0	0	150
	%	92.0%	7.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Walk in how we responded	n	136	10	1	0	0	0	147
	%	92.5%	6.8%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Walk in professional and efficient	n	138	12	0	0	0	0	150
	%	92.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	551	43	2	0	0	1	597
	%	92.3%	7.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: And how much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO INTERACT with our customer service counters?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	122	81.9%
Agree	24	16.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3	2.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	149	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Telephone Customer Service

2.6.7.3 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 85%

2.6.7.3 Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for phone contacts

Target: At least 85%

Methodology


LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

Phone:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with how FRIENDLY and RESPECTFUL the staff member you first spoke to was?
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you that they UNDERSTOOD WHAT YOU NEEDED?
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with HOW THEY RESPONDED to your enquiry? *This includes checking your needs were met and following up on any other issues*
4. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you that the Council's telephone customer service was PROFESSIONAL and EFFICIENT? *This includes waiting times, giving you fast service and providing helpful instructions*

Time in field: The telephone survey was in field in November and December 2025, with surveys conducted with residents who had called the CCC telephone customer services line in September and November 2025. 100% of surveys were completed by telephone


Completed Surveys: 150



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Phone manner	n	113	19	7	2	4	0	145
	%	77.9%	13.1%	4.8%	1.4%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Phone understanding of needs	n	106	22	3	6	7	0	144
	%	73.6%	15.3%	2.1%	4.2%	4.9%	0.0%	100.0%
Phone how we responded	n	98	15	9	6	16	1	145
	%	67.6%	10.3%	6.2%	4.1%	11.0%	0.7%	100.0%
Phone professional and efficient	n	107	19	8	4	7	0	145
	%	73.8%	13.1%	5.5%	2.8%	4.8%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	424	75	27	18	34	1	579
	%	73.2%	13.0%	4.7%	3.1%	5.9%	0.2%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: And how much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO INTERACT with us by telephone?



Agreement Results		
	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	105	72.4%
Agree	24	16.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	7	4.8%
Disagree	6	4.1%
Strongly Disagree	3	2.1%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	145	100.0%
Not applicable	6	

Activity: Communications and Engagement

External Communications

4.1.10.1 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: 79%

4.1.10.1 Resident satisfaction that our external communications, marketing and engagement activities are timely, accurate, relevant and clear

Target: 79%


Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that Council communications are **TIMELY**? *This means information is available at the right time*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that Council communications are **RELEVANT**? *This means information covers what the Council is doing and what you want to know*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that Council communications are **ACCURATE**? *This means information is correct*
4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that Council communications are **CLEAR** and **EASY TO UNDERSTAND**?

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place at a range of public sites between November and December 2025


Completed Surveys: 300



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Timely communications	n	65	147	49	15	3	16	295
	%	22.0%	49.8%	16.6%	5.1%	1.0%	5.4%	100.0%
Relevant communications	n	77	150	44	14	3	8	296
	%	26.0%	50.7%	14.9%	4.7%	1.0%	2.7%	100.0%
Accurate communications	n	69	181	27	5	1	14	297
	%	23.2%	60.9%	9.1%	1.7%	0.3%	4.7%	100.0%
Clean and easy to understand communications	n	96	163	24	7	3	6	299
	%	32.1%	54.5%	8.0%	2.3%	1.0%	2.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	307	641	144	41	10	44	1187
	%	25.9%	54.0%	12.1%	3.5%	0.8%	3.7%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE Council communications?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	63	21.6%
Agree	146	50.2%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	40	13.7%
Disagree	24	8.2%
Strongly Disagree	9	3.1%
Don't Know	9	3.1%
Total	291	100.0%
Not applicable	8	

Activity: Community Development and Facilities

Community Development and Capacity Building Initiatives

4.1.27.1 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: 80%

4.1.27.1 Customer satisfaction with the delivery of community support, resilience, development, and recreation initiatives
Target: 80%


Methodology

LOS score based on the survey question stated below:

- How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the SUPPORT GIVEN to your community group by Council community capacity building staff?
This includes community development, community support and community recreation staff being friendly, respectful and responsive. It also includes providing networking and collaboration opportunities, as well as providing information, resources and advice that is correct and helpful for developing resilience

Time in field: The online survey was in field in October and November 2025, with surveys emailed to 527 community groups that have had contact with community governance teams from January 2025. 100% of surveys were completed online


Completed Surveys: 275



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Support Given	n	154	84	24	8	2	0	272
LOS AVERAGE RATING	%	56.6%	30.9%	8.8%	2.9%	0.7%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO PARTICIPATE in our local community development and capacity building initiatives?



Agreement Results		
	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	77	28.4%
Agree	144	53.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	38	14.0%
Disagree	7	2.6%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.4%
Don't Know	4	1.5%
Total	271	100.0%
Not applicable	4	

Activity: Libraries Ngā Kete Wānanga o Ōtautahi

Libraries

3.1.5 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 90%

3.1.5 Maintain library user satisfaction with the library service

Target: At least 90%

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the three survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that library services are EFFICIENT, EASY TO UNDERSTAND and ACCESS? *This includes signs, self-service kiosks, computers, digital resources, free wifi, library catalogues and the library website*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the RANGE of books and other items available? *This includes books, magazines, DVDs, reference material and digital resources like digital eBooks, eMagazines, PressReader, LinkedIn Learning, etc*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with how FRIENDLY, KNOWLEDGEABLE and HELPFUL the library staff are?

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2025

Completed Surveys: 300


Library Site	Number
TURANGA	60
FENDALTON	60
MATATIKI HORNBY CENTRE	60
PAPANUI	60
SHIRLEY	60
Total	300



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Efficient, easy to understand and access	n	221	76	2	0	0	0	299
	%	73.9%	25.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Range of books and other items	n	159	101	24	3	0	9	296
	%	53.7%	34.1%	8.1%	1.0%	0.0%	3.0%	100.0%
Staff friendly, knowledgeable and helpful	n	214	71	2	1	0	10	298
	%	71.8%	23.8%	0.7%	0.3%	0.0%	3.4%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	594	248	28	4	0	19	893
	%	66.5%	27.8%	3.1%	0.4%	0.0%	2.1%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE the library service?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	153	51.5%
Agree	132	44.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	10	3.4%
Disagree	1	0.3%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	1	0.3%
Total	297	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Activity: Recreation, Sports, Community Arts and Events

Community Events

2.8.5.2 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 80%

2.8.5.2 Customer satisfaction with the content and delivery across delivered event

Target: At least 80%


Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the CONTENT of the event? *This includes what the event included and it being interesting and enjoyable*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the DELIVERY of the event? *This includes how it was run and presented*

Time in field: The online surveys were conducted with event attendees who attended a range of events at a range of dates in late 2025 and 2026


Completed Surveys: 810



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Event content	n	478	237	47	34	11	1	808
	%	59.2%	29.3%	5.8%	4.2%	1.4%	0.1%	100.0%
Event delivery	n	487	225	47	41	7	1	808
	%	60.3%	27.8%	5.8%	5.1%	0.9%	0.1%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	965	462	94	75	18	2	1616
	%	59.7%	28.6%	5.8%	4.6%	1.1%	0.1%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council made it EASY for you TO FIND INFORMATION about this event?



Agreement Results		
	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	382	47.6%
Agree	310	38.7%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	74	9.2%
Disagree	29	3.6%
Strongly Disagree	5	0.6%
Don't Know	2	0.2%
Total	802	100.0%

Event Support

2.8.6.2 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 80%

2.8.6.2 Customer satisfaction with the quality of Council event support

Target: At least 80%

Methodology


LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with how FRIENDLY and RESPECTFUL the Council Events Partnerships and Development Team staff you dealt with were?
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the ACCURACY of INFORMATION and ADVICE PROVIDED to you by staff? *This includes information that is correct and available to you*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the staff member's ABILITY TO RESPOND to your needs? *This includes helping you willingly and promptly, understanding your needs and offering information and options to meet your needs*
4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the INFORMATION PROVIDED on the 'Running an event' support pages on the COUNCIL WEBSITE? *This includes the website being user-friendly and information that is correct and useful*

Time in field: The online survey was in field in October and November 2025, with surveys emailed to 184 respondents who had used the Events Partnerships and Development Team's services from October 2024 onward. 100% of surveys were completed online.

Completed Surveys: 66


Satisfaction with Events Partnerships and Development Team Support Provided to Events Sector (LOS 2.8.6.2)



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Staff friendly and respectful	n	47	17	2	0	0	0	66
	%	71.2%	25.8%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Accuracy of information and advice	n	43	18	3	0	1	0	65
	%	66.2%	27.7%	4.6%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Ability to respond	n	46	12	5	1	1	0	65
	%	70.8%	18.5%	7.7%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Events support web pages	n	23	25	6	1	0	4	59
	%	39.0%	42.4%	10.2%	1.7%	0.0%	6.8%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	159	72	16	2	2	4	255
	%	62.4%	28.2%	6.3%	0.8%	0.8%	1.6%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting with or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE our events support service?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	29	45.3%
Agree	25	39.1%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	7	10.9%
Disagree	2	3.1%
Strongly Disagree	1	1.6%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	64	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Recreation and Sport Support

7.0.3.2 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 80%

7.0.3.2 Customer satisfaction with the quality of Council recreation and sport support

Target: At least 80%

Methodology


LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the three survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with how FRIENDLY and RESPECTFUL the Council Recreation and Sport Services Team staff member/s you dealt with were?
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the ACCURACY of INFORMATION and ADVICE PROVIDED to you by staff? *This includes information that is correct and available to you*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the staff member's ABILITY TO RESPOND to your needs? *This includes helping you willingly and promptly, understanding your needs and offering information and options to meet your needs*

Time in field: The online survey was in field in October and November 2025, with surveys emailed to 466 respondents who had used the Recreation Services Team's services from January 2025. 100% of surveys were completed online

Completed Surveys: 148


Satisfaction with Support Provided to Recreation and Sport Sectors (LOS 7.0.3.2)



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Staff friendly and respectful	n	97	44	4	3	0	0	148
	%	65.5%	29.7%	2.7%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Accuracy of information and advice	n	72	66	6	3	0	0	147
	%	49.0%	44.9%	4.1%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Ability to respond	n	71	57	7	8	1	1	145
	%	49.0%	39.3%	4.8%	5.5%	0.7%	0.7%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	240	167	17	14	1	1	440
	%	54.5%	38.0%	3.9%	3.2%	0.2%	0.2%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE our recreation and sport support service?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	43	30.1%
Agree	75	52.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	15	10.5%
Disagree	7	4.9%
Strongly Disagree	2	1.4%
Don't Know	1	0.7%
Total	143	100.0%
Not applicable	3	

Recreation and Sport Facilities

7.0.7 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: At least 80%

7.0.7 Customer satisfaction with the range and quality of facilities

Target: At least 80%

Methodology²

LOS score based on the survey question stated below:

1. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you as a customer of this centre?


Time in field: Face to face surveying of casual users of seven facilities took place between November and December 2025. An online survey of facility members and concession card holders was carried out between August and December 2025. 100% of casual surveys were completed face to face and 100% of member and concession surveys were completed online.

Completed Surveys: 2,601

Sites Surveyed:

² Prior to 2022-2023, LOS 7.0.7 was measured via the University of South Australia's CERM Survey. Measurement of the LOS was moved to in-house point of contact surveying in 2022-2023.


Recreation and Sport Centre Site	Number
Graham Condon Rec and Sport Centre	261
Jellie Park Rec and Sport Centre	465
Matatiki Hornby Centre	210
Pioneer Rec and Sport Centre	653
Taiora QEII Rec and Sport Centre	695
Te Pou Toetoe Linwood Pool	265
Te Hapua Halswell Pool (casual users only)	25
Waltham Pool (casual users only)	25
Site unknown	2
Total	2,601



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Overall Satisfaction with Centre	n	1365	1030	144	42	10	9	2600
LOS AVERAGE RATING	%	52.5%	39.6%	5.5%	1.6%	0.4%	0.3%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE our recreation and sport centres?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	1286	49.5%
Agree	1128	43.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	121	4.7%
Disagree	31	1.2%
Strongly Disagree	13	0.5%
Don't Know	21	0.8%
Total	2600	100.0%

Activity: Parks and Foreshore

Community Parks

6.0.3 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: $\geq 60\%$

6.0.3 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Community Parks

Target: $\geq 60\%$

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

1. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of this park? *This includes layout, plants, trees and gardens*
2. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of this park? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*


Time in field: The mail drop postal and online survey was delivered to households in the vicinity of community parks in November and December 2025. Surveys were also completed using our Life in Christchurch online panel where respondents gave feedback on a range of local parks throughout the city

Completed Surveys: 233

Sites Surveyed:

Park Name	Number
ARRAN PLAYGROUND	8
ASHGROVE RESERVE	15
BADEN NORRIS RESERVE	10
BARNES RESERVE	10
BROOKFORD RESERVE	10
BROOKWATER RESERVE	15
CADOGAN RESERVE	2
CRAIGHEAD RESERVE	3
DARROCH RESERVE	11
DONCASTER RESERVE	14
FORTUNE PLAYGROUND	13
HELMORE PARK	9
HOCKEY PARK	13
MCMAHON RESERVE	12
NOODLUM PARK	8
PAPANUI STREAM ESPLANADE	12
PROVIDENCE RESERVE	11
RIVERLEA RECREATION RESERVE	8
ROCKPORT RESERVE	8
ROSSMORE RESERVE	9
SCRUTTONS RESERVE	7
TE ARA A RONGO - GLOUCESTER/WORCESTER PARK	6
THISTLEDOWN RESERVE	8
WATERFORD RESERVE	11
TOTAL	233


Overall Satisfaction with Presentation of Community Parks (LOS 6.0.3)



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Park appearance	n	33	112	19	40	23	2	229
	%	14.4%	48.9%	8.3%	17.5%	10.0%	0.9%	100.0%
Park condition	n	27	116	27	34	27	2	233
	%	11.6%	49.8%	11.6%	14.6%	11.6%	0.9%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	60	228	46	74	50	4	462
	%	13.0%	49.4%	10.0%	16.0%	10.8%	0.9%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE this park?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	44	19.8%
Agree	99	44.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	31	14.0%
Disagree	25	11.3%
Strongly Disagree	19	8.6%
Don't Know	4	1.8%
Total	222	100.0%
Not applicable	10	

Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale

6.2.2 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: $\geq 90\%$

6.2.2 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Garden Parks – Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale

Target: $\geq 90\%$

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of the Botanic Gardens? *This includes layout, plants, trees and gardens and layout and style of facilities such as the Visitor Centre, toilets, playgrounds, swimming pools and houses such as Cunningham House*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of the Gardens? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*

OR


1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of Mona Vale? *This includes layout, plants, trees and gardens and layout and style of facilities, such as the homestead and toilets*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of Mona Vale? *This includes things such as maintenance and how it is looked after*

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2025

Completed Surveys: 195

Park Name	Number
BOTANIC GARDENS	150
MONA VALE	45
Total	195


Overall Satisfaction with Presentation of the Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale (LOS 6.2.2)



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale appearance	n	175	19	0	0	0	0	194
	%	90.2%	9.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale condition	n	158	32	1	2	0	2	195
	%	81.0%	16.4%	0.5%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	333	51	1	2	0	2	389
	%	85.6%	13.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE <the Botanic Gardens> or <Mona Vale>?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	127	65.5%
Agree	54	27.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	7	3.6%
Disagree	3	1.5%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	3	1.5%
Total	194	100.0%
Not applicable	1	

Regional Parks

6.3.5 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: $\geq 80\%$

6.3.5 Customer satisfaction with the recreational opportunities and ecological experiences provided by the City's Regional Parks
Target: $\geq 80\%$

Methodology

LOS score based on the survey question stated below:

- How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the RANGE of RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES and NATURE EXPERIENCES at this park? *This includes areas for sitting, relaxing and playing (eg. spaces, seats, picnic areas and drinking fountains); play spaces; walking and biking tracks; and opportunities to enjoy nature (eg. native plantings and bird life)*


Time in field: Face to face and mail drop postal surveying took place between November and December 2025

Completed Surveys: 298

Sites Surveyed:

Regional Park	Number
GROYNES	8
HEATHCOTE QUARRY RESERVE	12
SCARBOROUGH BEACH	14


SCARBOROUGH HILL RESERVE	15
SOUTHSHORE BEACH PARK	9
SPENCER PARK BEACH	60
BOTTLE LAKE BEACH PARK	30
HALSWELL QUARRY PARK	30
NEW BRIGHTON BEACH (developed)	30
RAPAKI TRACK	30
ROTO KOHATU	30
VICTORIA PARK	30
Total	298



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Recreational opportunities and ecological experiences	n	122	126	31	6	2	6	293
LOS AVERAGE RATING	%	41.6%	43.0%	10.6%	2.0%	0.7%	2.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE this park?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	106	36.6%
Agree	141	48.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	20	6.9%
Disagree	13	4.5%
Strongly Disagree	4	1.4%
Don't Know	6	2.1%
Total	290	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Cemetery Administration Services

6.4.5 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: ≥ 95%

6.4.5 Customer satisfaction with cemetery administration services

Target: ≥ 95%


Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the INFORMATION PROVIDED about plot location, ownership and availability? *This includes information that is correct and available to you*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with how FRIENDLY and RESPECTFUL the Council Cemetery Support Officers are?
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that the (interment) application process is EASY TO USE? *This includes clear instructions and processes, and checking your needs were met and following up on any issues*
4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the (interment) application RESPONSE TIME? *This includes time taken to contact you and general timeliness of communication from us*

Time in field: The online survey was in field in October to November 2025, with surveys emailed to 73 funeral directors and monumental masons who had used the Cemetery administration services in the preceding 12 months. The survey was also emailed to 274 resident customers who had used the Cemetery administration services since January 2025 (this excluded those who had used the service in the eight weeks before the survey due to sensitivities). 100% of surveys were completed online

Completed Surveys: 159



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Provision of information	n	128	26	2	2	1	0	159
	%	80.5%	16.4%	1.3%	1.3%	0.6%	0.0%	100.0%
Staff friendly and respectful	n	137	13	2	2	0	3	157
	%	87.3%	8.3%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	1.9%	100.0%
Ease of use of interment process	n	42	8	0	0	1	0	51
	%	82.4%	15.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Interment application response time	n	44	5	0	0	1	0	50
	%	88.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	351	52	4	4	3	3	417
	%	84.2%	12.5%	1.0%	1.0%	0.7%	0.7%	100.0%

Cemeteries

6.4.4 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: ≥85%

6.4.4 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Cemeteries

Target: ≥ 85%

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of this cemetery? *This includes layout, plants, trees and gardens (excluding headstones)*


2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of this cemetery? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after (excluding headstones)*

Time in field: Face to face and mail drop postal surveying took place between November and December 2025

Completed Surveys: 132

Sites Surveyed:


Cemeteries	Number
AVONHEAD CEMETERY	30
BELFAST CEMETERY	30
MEMORIAL PARK CEMETERY	30
RURU LAWN CEMETERY	30
SYDENHAM CEMETERY	12
Total	132



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Cemeteries appearance	n	30	68	14	14	6	0	132
	%	22.7%	51.5%	10.6%	10.6%	4.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Cemeteries condition	n	20	75	15	15	7	0	132
	%	15.2%	56.8%	11.4%	11.4%	5.3%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	50	143	29	29	13	0	264
	%	18.9%	54.2%	11.0%	11.0%	4.9%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE this cemetery?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	35	26.5%
Agree	72	54.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	14	10.6%
Disagree	5	3.8%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	6	4.5%
Total	132	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Hagley Park

6.8.4.1 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: $\geq 90\%$

6.8.4.1 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of Hagley Park

Target: $\geq 90\%$


Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of Hagley Park? *This includes layout, plants, trees and gardens*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of Hagley Park? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2025


Completed Surveys: 150



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Park appearance	n	106	42	2	0	0	0	150
	%	70.7%	28.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Park condition	n	89	59	2	0	0	0	150
	%	59.3%	39.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	195	101	4	0	0	0	300
	%	65.0%	33.7%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: And how much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE this park?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	56	37.3%
Agree	75	50.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	10	6.7%
Disagree	6	4.0%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.7%
Don't Know	2	1.3%
Total	150	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Marine Structures

10.8.1.1 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: ≥ 60%

10.8.1.1 Customer satisfaction with the availability of public marine structure facilities
Target: ≥ 60%

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the five survey questions stated below:

Resident Users

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with being able to ACCESS marine structures for RECREATION? *This includes being in the right places and easy to get to and using them for things like launching boats, fishing and walking on them*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that there are ENOUGH marine structures of different types for RECREATION? *This includes wharves, jetties, ramps, rafts and moorings*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with being able to ACCESS marine structures for TRANSPORT? *This includes structures being in the right places and easy to get to for ferries, etc*

Commercial Operators

4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with being able to ACCESS marine structures for COMMERCIAL PURPOSES? *This includes structures being in the right places and easy to get to and using them for commercial activities such as launching boats, loading and unloading passengers and cargo, for refuelling and for tourism activities*

5. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that there are ENOUGH marine structures of the different types outlined above for COMMERCIAL PURPOSES?


Time in field: An online survey was infield in October and November 2025, with surveys emailed to 12 commercial users who had used marine structures in the preceding 12 months. 4 surveys were completed. 100% of surveys were completed online

Face to face surveying of residential marine structure users took place at marine structures between November and December 2025. In total 195 surveys were completed at 8 marine structures

Completed Surveys: 199 (including 4 commercial users)

Sites Surveyed (residential users):

Site	Number
Akaroa Boat Park and Recreation Ground Jetty and Slipway	15
Akaroa Wharf	30
Daly's Wharf	20
Diamond Harbour Wharf	33
Lyttleton Marina Public Ramp and Jetty	15
Moncks Bay Public Ramp	17
New Brighton Pier	50
Scarborough Beach Public Ramp	15
Total	195



Satisfaction Results Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Accessibility for recreation	n	56	99	14	13	2	7	191
	%	29.3%	51.8%	7.3%	6.8%	1.0%	3.7%	100.0%
Enough for recreation	n	18	77	30	37	7	20	189
	%	9.5%	40.7%	15.9%	19.6%	3.7%	10.6%	100.0%
Accessibility for transportation	n	36	85	19	12	4	16	172
	%	20.9%	49.4%	11.0%	7.0%	2.3%	9.3%	100.0%
Accessibility for commercial purposes	n	0	1	3	0	0	0	4
	%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Enough for commercial purposes	n	0	1	2	1	0	0	4
	%	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	110	263	68	63	13	43	560
	%	19.6%	47.0%	12.1%	11.3%	2.3%	7.7%	100.0%


Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Questions:

How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE this marine structure?

or

How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE marine structures for commercial purposes?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	70	36.1%
Agree	96	49.5%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	18	9.3%
Disagree	7	3.6%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	3	1.5%
Total	194	100.0%
Not applicable	1	

Environmental, Conservation, Water and Civil Defence Education Programmes

19.1.6 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: ≥ 95%

19.1.6 Teacher satisfaction with the delivery of Environmental, Conservation, Water, and Civil Defence education programmes
Target: ≥ 95%

Methodology

LOS score based on the survey question stated below:


Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the education programmes? *This includes things such as the relevance of course content, its delivery, the accuracy of information and advice provided, the manner and attentiveness of the course tutor toward participants, and the programme's ability to help students learn about protecting and enhancing our natural environment*

Time in field: The online pulse survey was in field throughout the year, with surveys emailed to teachers after their students had participated in education programmes over the year. 100% of surveys were completed online

Completed Surveys: 422

Education Programmes
A Waste of Time at various sites
Casting Magic with Worms at the Climate Action Campus
Casting Magic with Worms at the Curators House in the Botanic Gardens
Casting Magic with Worms at the EcoDrop Metro Place, Bromley
Coastal Management at New Brighton Beach
Coastal Management at North New Brighton Beach
Creative and Native at Halswell Quarry Park
Creative and Native at Spencer Park
Creative and Native in the Botanic Gardens
ECE - The Insect World - Te Aitanga Pekepe at Botanic Gardens
Fertilising for the Future (EM Bokashi) at the EcoDrop Metro Place, Bromley
Fertilising for the Future (Worms) at the EcoDrop Metro Place, Bromley
Forest Explorer at Spencer Park
Forest Explorer in Bottle Lake Forest
Freshwater Frolicking at Ernle Clark Reserve
Freshwater Frolicking at the Groynes
Future Proof : Climate Change
Junior Park Explorers at Ernle Clark Reserve
Junior Park Explorers at Halswell Quarry
Junior Park Explorers at Mona Vale
Junior Park Explorers at the Groynes
Junior Park Explorers in the Botanic Gardens
Junior Park Explorers in Travis Wetland
Junior Recycling programme in schools classroom


Native Nurturing in Halswell Quarry Park
Native Nurturing in Victoria Park
On the Rocks at Sumner Beach
On The Rocks at Taylors Mistake Beach
Park Detectives at Travis Wetland
Park Detectives in the Botanic Gardens
Rocky Road of Discovery at Halswell Quarry
Saving the Sand Dunes at New Brighton Beach
Saving the Sand Dunes at South Brighton Beach
Saving the Sand Dunes at Spencer Park Beach
Saving the Sand Dunes at Sumner Beach
Saving the Sand Dunes at Waimairi Beach
Searching the Shoreline at New Brighton beach
Searching the Shoreline at South Brighton Beach
Searching the Shoreline at Sumner Beach
Searching the Shoreline at Waimairi Beach
Stan's Got a Plan for Earthquakes
Stan's Got a Plan for Storms
Watch Your Waste at Metro Place, Bromley
Water for Life at Main Water Pumping Station
Wetlands, Waders and Water Boatmen at Travis Wetland



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Overall satisfaction	n	394	28	0	0	0	0	422
LOS RATING	%	93.4%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting with or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council made it EASY for you to interact with us regarding the education programme? *This includes respectful, prompt and efficient service by knowledgeable Council staff who understood your needs, and who provided you with accurate information and service that met your needs*



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	360	85.3%
Agree	55	13.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	7	1.7%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	422	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Activity: Building Regulation

Case Management Service

9.1.15.2 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: 80%

9.1.15.2 Customer satisfaction with quality Case Management Services

Target: 80%


Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the three survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the ACCURACY of the INFORMATION and ADVICE provided to you by the case managers? *This includes it being correct and reliable*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the case managers' ABILITY TO RESPOND to your needs? *This includes helping you willingly and promptly, understanding your needs and offering information and options to meet your needs*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with you with the MANNER of the case managers you dealt with? *This includes staff being approachable and supportive*

Time in field: The online survey was infield in October to November 2025, with surveys emailed to 153 case management service customers who used the service in the last 12 months. 100% of surveys were completed online


Completed Surveys: 51



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Accuracy of information and advice	n	40	8	2	0	1	0	51
	%	78.4%	15.7%	3.9%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Responsiveness of case managers	n	38	10	2	0	1	0	51
	%	74.5%	19.6%	3.9%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Manner of case managers	n	44	6	0	0	1	0	51
	%	86.3%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	122	24	4	0	3	0	153
	%	79.7%	15.7%	2.6%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: Acknowledging the statutory requirements councils and developers must meet, how much do you agree or disagree that the Council's case management service makes it EASY for you TO INTERACT with the Council for your development needs?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	29	59.2%
Agree	19	38.8%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	1	2.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	49	100.0%
Not applicable	1	

Activity: Resource Consenting

Resource Consenting Process

9.2.7 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: 70%

9.2.7 % Customer satisfaction with the resource consenting process

Target: 70%


Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

1. Thinking about this resource consent, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the ACCURACY of the INFORMATION and ADVICE PROVIDED to you by planner/s? *This includes information being correct and reliable*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with you with the TIMELINESS of the INFORMATION and ADVICE provided to you? *This includes planners providing information and advice promptly*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with you with the MANNER of the planner/s you dealt with? *This includes planners being friendly and respectful*
4. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with you with the TIME TAKEN to PROCESS your Consent application?

Time in field: The online survey was infield in October and November 2025, with surveys emailed to 342 resource consents applicants from January 2025. 100% of surveys were completed online


Completed Surveys: 84



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Accuracy of information and advice	n	22	41	12	3	4	0	82
	%	26.8%	50.0%	14.6%	3.7%	4.9%	0.0%	100.0%
Timeliness of information and advice	n	25	34	14	7	3	0	83
	%	30.1%	41.0%	16.9%	8.4%	3.6%	0.0%	100.0%
Staff manner	n	36	38	5	1	3	0	83
	%	43.4%	45.8%	6.0%	1.2%	3.6%	0.0%	100.0%
Time taken to process consents	n	17	37	16	8	4	1	83
	%	20.5%	44.6%	19.3%	9.6%	4.8%	1.2%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	100	150	47	19	14	1	331
	%	30.2%	45.3%	14.2%	5.7%	4.2%	0.3%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: Taking into account the legal requirements of the consent process, how much do you agree or disagree that the Council made it STRAIGHTFORWARD for you to have your resource consent processed?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	13	15.5%
Agree	36	42.9%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	17	20.2%
Disagree	8	9.5%
Strongly Disagree	9	10.7%
Don't Know	1	1.2%
Total	84	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Activity: Transport

Perception of Vehicle and Personal Safety at Council Off-Street Parking Facilities

10.3.7 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: 50%

10.3.7 % Customer agreement with the perception of vehicle and personal safety at council off-street parking facilities
Target: 50%

Methodology³

Score calculated as an aggregate of the three survey questions stated below:


1. How much do you agree or disagree that your MOTOR VEHICLE is SAFER in Council off-street parking compared to on-street parking? *This includes theft, damage from other cars or from posts, bollards or other things and damage from people (like vandalism)*
2. Thinking about your PERSONAL SAFETY, how much do you agree or disagree that you feel safe using Council off-street parking DURING THE DAY?
3. Thinking about your PERSONAL SAFETY, how much do you agree or disagree that you feel safe using Council off-street parking AFTER DARK?

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2025

Completed Surveys: 200

Sites Surveyed: 2

Parking Facilities	Number
ART GALLERY PARKING BUILDING	50
LICHFIELD PARKING BUILDING	150
Total	200




³ **NB:** The 2021-2022 LOS 10.3.7 results came from the General Service Satisfaction Survey and from 2022-2024 onward results came from point of contact surveys. Results across 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 are not comparable as the General Service Satisfaction Survey was carried out online, included non-users of Council parking buildings and was not restricted to assessment at two facilities. The 2022-2023 survey was carried out onsite at two facilities only and did not include non-users of parking buildings. In 2021-2022, a trial survey was carried out onsite at the Art Gallery and Lichfield parking buildings with the following results which are comparable to 2022-2023 results: 82% satisfied, 12% neither and 5% dissatisfied.

Agreement Results		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Vehicle safety in Council off-street parking	n	56	110	26	2	1	3	198
	%	28.3%	55.6%	13.1%	1.0%	0.5%	1.5%	100.0%
Personal safety during the day	n	84	86	22	5	0	1	198
	%	42.4%	43.4%	11.1%	2.5%	0.0%	0.5%	100.0%
Personal safety after dark	n	34	69	29	24	2	7	165
	%	20.6%	41.8%	17.6%	14.5%	1.2%	4.2%	100.0%
AVERAGE RATING	n	174	265	77	31	3	11	561
	%	31.0%	47.2%	13.7%	5.5%	0.5%	2.0%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE Council parking?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	55	27.6%
Agree	116	58.3%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	12	6.0%
Disagree	16	8.0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	199	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Public Transport Facilities

10.4.4 Recommended Level of Service Performance Target: $\geq 73\%$

10.4.4 Improve customer satisfaction with public transport facilities (quality of bus stops and bus priority measures)

Target: $\geq 73\%$

Methodology

LOS score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below⁴:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with how EASY it is to USE bus stops in Christchurch? *This includes the seating, shelters, information provided, location of stops, protection against weather conditions, and the ease of boarding and getting on and off buses at bus stops*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of bus stops in Christchurch? *This includes the maintenance and cleanliness of seats, signs, shelters, and real-time information displays and the presence of graffiti or vandalism*

Thinking now about the places you travel to by bus in Christchurch, how much do you agree or disagree that BUS PRIORITY lanes and traffic lights that let buses enter intersections before other vehicles...


3. REDUCE YOUR TRAVEL TIME by bus?
4. Help buses STAY ON TIME

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2025

Completed Surveys: 250

Sites Surveyed: 2

Bus Infrastructure	Number
BUS INTERCHANGE	200
RICCARTON BUS LOUNGE	50
Total	250



⁴ Results cannot be compared to 2023-2024 results due to changes in questions and measures.

Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Bus stop ease of use	n	106	119	13	9	2	1	250
	%	42.4%	47.6%	5.2%	3.6%	0.8%	0.4%	100.0%
Bus stop condition	n	54	134	41	16	3	1	249
	%	21.7%	53.8%	16.5%	6.4%	1.2%	0.4%	100.0%
Bus priority lanes reduce travel times	n	45	140	27	12	5	15	244
	%	18.4%	57.4%	11.1%	4.9%	2.0%	6.1%	100.0%
Bus priority lanes help buses stay on time	n	31	151	23	22	5	13	245
	%	12.7%	61.6%	9.4%	9.0%	2.0%	5.3%	100.0%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	236	544	104	59	15	30	988
	%	23.9%	55.1%	10.5%	6.0%	1.5%	3.0%	100.0%

Appendix 1: Satisfaction Results for Additional Services

A range of services continue to be surveyed as part of the Residents Survey programme for organisation performance trend monitoring purposes

Email Customer Service

Quality of the Service Received for Email Services


Methodology

Score calculated as an aggregate of the eight survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you that our email customer service was **EFFICIENT** to use? *This includes saving you time and making it easy for information to be communicated between you and the Council*
2. How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it **EASY** for you **TO MAKE CONTACT** with us using email?

Time in field: The online survey was in field in October to December 2025, with surveys emailed to 2,253 residents who had emailed the CCC email customer services email address from June to September. In total, 342 surveys were completed. 100% of surveys were completed online

Completed Surveys: 342



Results		Very Satisfied / Strongly Agree	Satisfied / Agree	Neither	Dissatisfied / Disagree	Very Dissatisfied / Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Email efficient way to communicate	n	117	125	29	25	30	9	335
	%	35%	37%	9%	7%	9%	3%	100%
Email ease of contact	n	89	157	47	21	14	7	335
	%	27%	47%	14%	6%	4%	2%	100%
LOS AVERAGE RATING	n	206	282	76	46	44	16	670
	%	31%	42%	11%	7%	7%	2%	100%

Community Facilities

Range and Quality of Council Operated Community Facilities

Methodology

Score calculated as an aggregate of the eight survey questions stated below:


1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the **CONDITION** of this facility? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the **AVAILABILITY** of this facility? *This includes being able to book it when you want to use it*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are that people can **GET AROUND** and **ACCESS** this facility? *This includes the location of the facility, car parking and disability access*
4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that this facility is **FIT FOR PURPOSE** for your activities? *This includes layout, equipment, lighting, appliances and furnishings*
5. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that this facility gives **VALUE FOR THE MONEY** you pay to use it?
6. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the **ACCURACY OF INFORMATION PROVIDED** about this facility? *This includes clear signs and instructions and information that is correct and available to people*
7. Thinking about Council community facilities **IN CHRISTCHURCH**, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the **RANGE** of facilities available for hire and use? *This includes options (like size and type) to meet your needs*
8. Thinking now about community facilities **IN YOUR LOCAL AREA**, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the **RANGE** of facilities available for hire and use?

Time in field: The online survey was in field in October and November 2025, with surveys emailed to 236 people who had hired Council Community Facilities from January 2025. 100% of surveys were completed online

Completed Surveys: 100

Community Facilities	Number Completed Surveys
Abberley Park Hall	1
Aranui/Wainoni Community Centre	7
Avice Hill Community Centre	2
Fendalton Community Centre	8
Harvard Community Lounge	5
Hei Hei Community Centre	5
Landsdowne Community Centre	2
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Facility	1
Matuku Takotako Sumner Centre	2
North New Brighton Community Centre	4
Orauwata Bishopdale Library and Community Centre	7
Parklands Community Centre	3
Parkview Community Lounge	5
Rarakau Riccarton Centre	10
South New Brighton Community Centre	2
St Martins Community Centre	9
Te Hapua Halswell Centre	13
Templeton Community Centre	5


Waimairi Community Centre	9
Total	100



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Condition	n	50	35	10	5	0	0	100
	%	50.0%	35.0%	10.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Availability	n	50	43	3	4	0	0	100
	%	50.0%	43.0%	3.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Getting around and accessing	n	51	40	5	4	0	0	100
	%	51.0%	40.0%	5.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Fit for purpose	n	48	40	7	4	1	0	100
	%	48.0%	40.0%	7.0%	4.0%	1.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Value for money	n	52	39	8	0	1	0	100
	%	52.0%	39.0%	8.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Accuracy of information	n	47	50	2	1	0	0	100
	%	47.0%	50.0%	2.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Range of facilities in Christchurch	n	26	49	13	2	0	6	96
	%	27.1%	51.0%	13.5%	2.1%	0.0%	6.3%	100.0%
Range of facilities in local area	n	24	42	16	8	0	7	97
	%	24.7%	43.3%	16.5%	8.2%	0.0%	7.2%	100.0%
AVERAGE RATING	n	348	338	64	28	2	13	793
	%	43.9%	42.6%	8.1%	3.5%	0.3%	1.6%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE Council-operated community facilities?



Agreement Results		
	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	29	29.0%
Agree	56	56.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	10	10.0%
Disagree	3	3.0%
Strongly Disagree	2	2.0%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	100	100.0%
Not applicable	0	

Sports Parks

Presentation of Sports Parks

Methodology

Score calculated as an aggregate of the three survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are with the RANGE OF SPORTS SUPPORT FACILITIES available at this park? *This includes toilets, changing rooms and drinking fountains*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of this park? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with INFORMATION PROVIDED for this park? *This includes clear signs and information that is available to people*


Time in field: Face to face and mail drop postal surveying took place between November and December 2025

Completed Surveys: 227

Sites Surveyed:

Park Name	Number
CLARE PARK	18
CYPRESS GARDEN RESERVE	12
ENGLISH PARK	12
GARRICK PARK	7
HAGLEY PARK NORTH	18
HEATHCOTE DOMAIN	14
ROLLERDROME RESERVE	6
WOOLSTON PARK	10
BURNSIDE PARK	40
HAGLEY PARK SOUTH	30
LANCASTER PARK	30
NGA PUNA WAI	30
TOTAL	227


Overall Satisfaction with Range and Quality of Sports Parks



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Sport support facilities	n	45	120	25	15	5	11	221
	%	20.4%	54.3%	11.3%	6.8%	2.3%	5.0%	100.0%
Park condition	n	90	102	4	16	5	4	221
	%	40.7%	46.2%	1.8%	7.2%	2.3%	1.8%	100.0%
Park information provided	n	46	107	27	16	3	22	221
	%	20.8%	48.4%	12.2%	7.2%	1.4%	10.0%	100.0%
Getting around park	n	80	119	10	11	1	4	225
	%	35.6%	52.9%	4.4%	4.9%	0.4%	1.8%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council make it EASY for you TO USE this park?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	71	31.6%
Agree	117	52.0%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	20	8.9%
Disagree	7	3.1%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.4%
Don't Know	9	4.0%
Total	225	100.0%
Not applicable	1	

Regional Parks

Presentation of Regional Parks

Methodology


Score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of this park? *This includes layout, plants, trees and gardens*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of this park? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*

Time in field: Face to face and mail drop postal surveying took place between November and December 2025

Completed Surveys: 298

Sites Surveyed: see list in Regional Parks section above



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Park appearance	n	104	133	28	23	4	1	293
	%	35.5%	45.4%	9.6%	7.8%	1.4%	0.3%	100.0%
Park condition	n	89	148	21	22	7	4	291
	%	30.6%	50.9%	7.2%	7.6%	2.4%	1.4%	100.0%
AVERAGE RATING	n	193	281	49	45	11	5	584
	%	33.0%	48.1%	8.4%	7.7%	1.9%	0.9%	100.0%

Marine Structures

Presentation of Marine Structures

Methodology


Score calculated as an aggregate of the two survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of this marine structure? *This includes layout, type and style of facilities*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of this marine structure? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after*

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2025

Completed Surveys: 195

Sites Surveyed: see list in Marine Structures section above



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Marine structure appearance	n	67	90	21	15	1	1	195
	%	34.4%	46.2%	10.8%	7.7%	0.5%	0.5%	100.0%
Marine structure condition	n	42	87	31	29	4	2	195
	%	21.5%	44.6%	15.9%	14.9%	2.1%	1.0%	100.0%
AVERAGE RATING	n	109	177	52	44	5	3	390
	%	27.9%	45.4%	13.3%	11.3%	1.3%	0.8%	100.0%

Governance and Decision Making: People Who Attended Hearings or Made Deputations

Methodology

Time in field: The online survey was in field in October 2025, with surveys emailed to 958 people who had attended a hearing or made a deputation to the Council or to a Council committee or community board from January 2025. 100% of surveys were completed online


Completed Surveys: 246

Understanding of Council Decisions

Questions

Score calculated as an aggregate of the three survey questions stated below:

1. How much do you agree or disagree that you UNDERSTAND how the Council makes decisions?
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the ACCURACY of information provided to you about Council decisions? *This includes being able to rely on what you are told and information being clear, correct and available to people*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that the public receives information about decision making in a PROMPT and TIMELY manner?




Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied / Strongly Agree	Satisfied / Agree	Neither	Dissatisfied / Disagree	Very Dissatisfied / Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Understanding of decision making	n	48	122	32	26	15	1	244
	%	19.7%	50.0%	13.1%	10.7%	6.1%	0.4%	100.0%
Accuracy of information about decisions	n	18	82	58	56	31	1	246
	%	7.3%	33.3%	23.6%	22.8%	12.6%	0.4%	100.0%
Prompt and timely information about decisions	n	13	84	59	52	33	2	243
	%	5.3%	34.6%	24.3%	21.4%	13.6%	0.8%	100.0%
AVERAGE RATING	n	79	288	149	134	79	4	733
	%	10.8%	39.3%	20.3%	18.3%	10.8%	0.5%	100.0%

Public Influence on Council Decision Making

Question

Score based on the survey question stated below:

1. How much INFLUENCE do you feel the public has on the decisions the Council makes?




Satisfaction Results		Large Influence	Some Influence	Small Influence	No Influence	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results							
Influence on decision making	n	11	79	99	53	2	244
AVERAGE RATING	%	4.5%	32.4%	40.6%	21.7%	0.8%	100.0%

Opportunities to Participate in and Contribute to Council Decision Making

Question

1. How much do you agree or disagree that you have adequate OPPORTUNITIES TO HAVE A SAY in what the Council does?




Agreement Results		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Opportunities to have a say	n	33	100	31	42	33	2	241
AVERAGE RATING	%	13.7%	41.5%	12.9%	17.4%	13.7%	0.8%	100.0%

Decision Making Processes Easy to Use and Engage With

Question

1. How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE and ENGAGE with our decision making processes? *This includes clear instructions about processes and timelines, having options for engaging with us and being able to talk to staff and elected members about decisions*




Agreement Results		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Decision making processes being easy to use and engage with	n	23	85	47	54	30	2	241
AVERAGE RATING	%	9.5%	35.3%	19.5%	22.4%	12.4%	0.8%	100.0%

Making Decisions in Best Interests of City

Questions

- How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that the Council MAKES DECISIONS that are in the BEST INTERESTS of the city?



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Decisions made in best interests of city	n	7	66	60	64	43	2	242
AVERAGE RATING	%	2.9%	27.3%	24.8%	26.4%	17.8%	0.8%	100.0%

Public Transport Facilities

Appearance, Safety and Ease of Use of Bus Interchange and Hubs

Methodology


Score calculated as an aggregate of the four survey questions stated below:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the APPEARANCE of the Bus Interchange OR Hub/Lounge? *This includes layout, type and design*
2. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the CONDITION of the Bus Interchange OR Hub/Lounge? *This includes maintenance and how it is looked after (like cleanliness and no graffiti and vandalism)*
3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your PERSONAL SAFETY at the Interchange OR Hub/Lounge DURING THE DAY? *This includes safety from crime, amount of lighting, and road safety (like separating people from buses and other road users)*
4. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your PERSONAL SAFETY at the Interchange OR Hub/Lounge AFTER DARK?

Time in field: Face to face surveying took place between November and December 2025

Completed Surveys: 250


Sites Surveyed: Bus Interchange, Riccarton Bus Lounge



Satisfaction Results		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know	TOTAL
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results								
Interchange appearance	n	67	116	10	4	2	0	199
	%	33.7%	58.3%	5.0%	2.0%	1.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Interchange condition	n	53	129	9	3	3	2	199
	%	26.6%	64.8%	4.5%	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	100.0%
Interchange safety during day	n	67	111	16	3	1	0	198
	%	33.8%	56.1%	8.1%	1.5%	0.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Interchange safety at night	n	20	48	19	15	2	18	122
	%	16.4%	39.3%	15.6%	12.3%	1.6%	14.8%	100.0%
Suburban hub appearance	n	20	28	2	0	0	0	50
	%	40.0%	56.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Suburban hub condition	n	24	25	1	0	0	0	50
	%	48.0%	50.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Suburban hub safety during day	n	24	23	1	1	0	0	49
	%	49.0%	46.9%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Suburban hub safety at night	n	8	12	1	3	2	1	27
	%	29.6%	44.4%	3.7%	11.1%	7.4%	3.7%	100.0%
AVERAGE RATING	n	283	492	59	29	10	21	894
	%	31.7%	55.0%	6.6%	3.2%	1.1%	2.3%	100.0%

Customer Effort: Ease of Interacting With or Using Council Services

Question: How much do you agree or disagree that the Council makes it EASY for you TO USE the Interchange (or suburban hub/lounge)?



Agreement Results	Number	Percent
Not Applicable responses have been removed from the results		
Strongly Agree	116	47.2%
Agree	122	49.6%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	2.0%
Disagree	1	0.4%
Strongly Disagree	2	0.8%
Don't Know	0	0.0%
Total	246	100.0%
Not applicable	1	